IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated:- 22.08.2006

Coram:-

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice P.SATHASIVAM
and
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice S. MANIKUMAR

Habeas Corpus Petition No.526 of 2006

Jayalakshmi ... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Magistrate and District Collector,
   Nagapattinam District
   Nagapattinam.

2. The Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
   Prohibition and Excise Department,
   Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009. ... Respondents

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the records of the first respondent, pertaining to the detention order made in C.O.C.No.13 of 2006 dated 27.04.2006 and quash the same and direct the respondents to produce the person or body of the detenu Vaithi @ Vaithilingam, aged about 49 years S/o Somu, who was confined in the Central Prison, Trichy before this Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.O.S. Thilak Pasumbadiyar
For Respondents : Mr.M. Babu Muthu Meeran
Addl. Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by P.SATHASIVAM, J.)

The petitioner, who is the wife of the detenu by name Rajendran, who was detained as a ''Bootlegger" as contemplated under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982(Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982), by the impugned detention order dated 27.04.2006, challenges the same in this Petition.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondents.

3. At the foremost, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is delay in disposal of the representation of the detenu, which vitiates the ultimate order of detention. With reference to the above claim, learned Additional Public Prosecutor has placed the details, which show that the representation of the detenu dated Nil was received by the Government on 23.05.2006 and remarks were called for on 24.05.2006. Thereafter, the remarks were received by the Government on 05.06.2006 and the File was submitted on 06.06.2006 and the same was dealt with by the Under Secretary and the Deputy Secretary on the same day i.e., on 06.06.2006 itself and finally, the Minister for Prohibition and Excise passed orders on 07.06.2006. The rejection letter was prepared on 08.06.2006 and the same was sent to the detenu on 08.06.2006 and served to him on 10.06.2006. As rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the representation was sent to the sponsoring authority to call for remarks from them on 29.05.2006, only on 02.06.2006, the sponsoring authority has sent a report to the Government, there is no explanation at all for taking time for sending the remarks. In the absence of any explanation by the person concerned, we are of the view that the time taken by the sponsoring authority is on the higher side and we hold that the said delay has prejudiced the detenu in disposal of his representation. On this ground, we quash the impugned order of detention.

4. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned order of detention is set aside. The detenu is directed to be set at liberty forthwith from the custody unless he is required in some other case or cause.

kh

Sd/
Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst.Registrar

To

1. The Secretary to the Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,Prohibition and
Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Magistrate and District
Collector, Nagapattinam District.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

3. The Superintendent, Central Prison,
   Tiruchirappalli.

4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
   Public (Law and Order)
   Fort St. George, Chennai-9.

5. The Public Prosecutor,
   High Court, Madras.

HCP. No.526 of 2006

JRG(CO)
RVL 28.05.2006

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/